



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—SERVIUS AND THE SCHOLIA OF DANIEL.

PART I.

The determination of the relation of the two masses of comments passing under the name of Servius is dependent upon an analysis of the language used by each. Little can be gained from a consideration of the facts they present. When the comments were written there were in existence large masses of critical material, at the disposal of any writer who wished to make use of them, so that sameness or similarity in facts stated really indicates nothing more than that the writers had access to the same sources. However, two considerations seem to have an application to Servius: comments in which the Scholia merely repeat, in the same or slightly varied language, the statements of Servius indicate the absence of the unifying work of a single writer; comments containing varied or even antagonistic statements may indicate an attempt of a single writer to present, in outline or entirety, all the views with which he had met. But as these are not sufficient for the settlement of the authorship of the comments, we are thrown back upon facts of language independent of the opinions presented. This must be the line of investigation, unless we practically abandon the question by assuming that the Servius merely presents the statements of the sources followed. Nothing is settled by this, for all questions under discussion referring to the Servius are in this way transferred to the sources themselves.

‘Servius’ may be considered as the work of different writers; as works derived by different writers from the same sources, or as an abridged and unabridged edition of the same work. The last two theories are dependent for their support on the proof of the homogeneity of language in the two masses of comments, for in either case the derivative work must have the same elements as its source.

In the following paper is given a partial consideration of some facts presented by the vocabulary in the Servius and the Scholia with the design of applying these facts in a discussion of the homogeneity of the language in the two works. While statistics

are not proof absolute in questions of authorship where only a few points are involved, where there is a very noticeable divergence on many points, statistics must have considerable weight. But mere number of occurrences must be reduced to a common base. The occurrence, in the two commentaries, of a large number of expressions, especially *etiam* and *scilicet*, each occurring hundreds of times in both, with the ratio of three to one, indicates that that must be about the ratio of the mass of the two commentaries. The careful measurement of the ems on several score of pages in different parts indicates about the same ratio. Bearing this in mind we may consider that where the ratio, excepting in the case of expressions occurring but a few times, where ratios are of no value, varies much from 3 : 1 there may be held to be a different attitude on the part of the two commentaries toward that expression. This must be constantly borne in mind, for the disproof of the homogeneity of expression does not depend on the establishment of the fact of complete dissimilarity in form of expression, but on the establishment of the fact that the habitual choice of form of expression by one is in many instances decidedly different from that of the other. As the comments are on the same subjects, it is not at all remarkable that there is great similarity in the two vocabularies. But with this similarity there are numerous most striking dissimilarities which can not be explained except upon the basis of different authorship for the two masses of comments.

The divisions in the following paper are not in all cases absolutely exact, as it has been found convenient at times to put into some divisions some terms which in a closer analysis would be placed by themselves. But as the design is to present some of the general features of the vocabulary in the two masses of comments, the division into parts is sufficiently exact for that purpose. Repeated examinations of the entire mass in working out the different phases presented have given to the results as much accuracy as can be hoped for where the text itself must depend to some extent upon the work of the editor.

The comments are referred to as S. and D., the latter standing for those not found in the Servian codices, and figures given (:) indicate the number of occurrences of different expressions in each. Merely for convenience, D. is spoken of as if it were the work of a single writer, even though evidence is presented indicating that it is by different men. The design is to compare the

masses of comments, and at only a few points will the usage of some of the MSS be mentioned.

I.—PERSONAL ELEMENT.

A. References to Commentator.—1. First Person Singular.

In two passages S. refers to a preceding comment using the first person of the perfect indicative: 11, 886¹ *ut supra dixi*; B. Praef. (p. 4, 10) *sicut supra dixi*. There are four other passages in S. where the first person of the verb is used referring to the commentator: 1, 258 *ut si dicas 'legi oratorem' nec addas quem, intelligo Ciceronem*; 1, 417 *si autem sertos dixero, addo flores, si sertas, addo coronas*; 3, 182 *nam expertum rerum si dixero, significo peritum; si expertem, ignarum*; 10, 341 *quando dico 'moriturus est' vere moriturus est*. In D., the use of the first person is confined to the comments on B. and G., excepting 1, 651 *nescio quibus disciplinis*; and 11, 247 *vi nescio qua*. Parenthetic *ut puto* occurs twice: G. 3, 3 *legitur et 'carmine,' et, ut puto, rectius*; G. 3, 296 *sed, ut puto, 'mox' abundat*. The other passages where *puto* is used are G. 2, 333 *an ideo non metuit, quia non surgunt? quod magis puto*; G. 4, 219 *sed ego puto simpliciter referri sententias philosophorum*. Only one passage does not have *puto*, and there S. also has the present: B. 8, 4 *quiesco enim duplicem habet significationem et aliter dico 'quiesco ego,' aliter 'quiesco servum,' id est quiescere facio*. Here the *facio* of S. is merely a part of a general explanation, and is not classed with the ones given above, as are not several passages in which S. explains the words of Vergil; e. g. G. 3, 40 *interim georgica scribo*; G. 3, 46 *postquam georgica scripsero*; and some passages in which the words of Vergil are explained as if they had been spoken by some of the characters, e. g. 12, 74 *ac si diceret: si imminet, periturus sum, etiam si minime ad bella proficiscar*; B. 7, 36 *si tot agnos habuero quot oves*.

2. First Person Plural.

a. Perfect and Present.—1. *Diximus* (405 : 4).—The references in the Servius to preceding comments are in nearly all cases expressed by *diximus*, most frequently with *supra*, e. g. 1, 175

¹References to the Aeneid do not designate the work, as do those to the Bucolics and Georgics. The text of Thilo-Hagen has been used.

SUCCEPIT pro suscepit, ut diximus supra. A few other particles are used; e. g. 1, 37 et hoc fictum est, ut superius diximus; 1, 231 subaudis filius . . . ut ante diximus; 2, 683 NE QUA qua vacat, ut frequenter diximus; 4, 697 nam, ut saepe diximus, secundum sectas loquitur; 10, 91 et istam historiam quam modo diximus. In many of the passages *ut* only is used; e. g. 1, 286 et omnis poetae intentio, ut in qualitate carminis diximus. In only a comparatively few instances is the passage referred to definitely indicated, though this is more common in the later than in the early portions of the commentary: 2, 592 ut enim in primo diximus; G. 1, 404 de quo plenius in bucolicis diximus; G. 2, 201 ut in Aeneide diximus. *Docuimus* is used G. 1, 488 COMETAE crinitae, pessimae, quia sunt et bonae, ut docuimus in Aeneide. The use of *memoravimus*, excepting 11, 260, is confined to comments on B. and G. (B. Praef., p. 3, 29; B. 6, 61; G. 2, 170; 2, 541; 3, 338). Aside from these verbs there are few others used: *notavimus* 1, 76; *tractavimus* 5, 522; *exposuimus* 6, 132. In D. there are but four similar references: 2, 152; 4, 246 (a repetition of a comment in S.); 10, 164 (*ex uno Turonensi edidit Daniel.*); 10, 423 (*hab. T.*) capillorem diximus, a statement apparently not found elsewhere in the commentary as we have it.

2. *Legimus* (144 : 4).—While the two commentaries do not differ as much in the use of this verb as in the case of *diximus*, the few number of occurrences in D. must be taken as an indication of a different critical attitude toward the material accessible. Two of the statements in D. refer to the words of Vergil, while the two others are general references (2, 512; 12, 144). The statements in S. refer both to passages in Vergil, e. g. 12, 766 legimus enim in Vergilio de tibiis, and in other writers, e. g. G. 4, 218 ut in Sallustio legimus, as well as to the proper reading in the passage under consideration, e. g. 1, 100 et 'sub undis' legimus et 'sub undas'; 4, 9 et 'terret' et 'terrent' legitur. sed si 'terret' legerimus, 'insomnia' erit vigilia. In a great majority of the instances the reference is to an illustrative passage.

3. *Intellegimus* (220 : 10).—This form is used a little more frequently than the last, though the personal element in S. is still much more clearly marked.

4. *Dicimus* (423 : 77).—This form of *dico* is the one most frequently used, and states the usage of the writer as well as of the community in which he lived, e. g. G. 4, 421 et melius 'hic obex,' quam 'haec obex' dicimus; G. 4, 417 in singulari numero

'hoc specus,' in plurali 'hi specus' dicimus; B. 1, 32 nam modo servi tantum peculium dicimus.

5. *Accipimus* (79 : 52).—This verb seems to have been a favorite with the writer of D., and the relative number of occurrences is larger than in S., which is the reverse of the usage in the case of other verbs.

6. Other Verbs (632 : 94).—In this list is included a large number of verbs whose meaning has no special significance. In a few, however, the distinction between S. and D. is clearly shown : *Scimus* (S. 27), *invenimus* (S. 23), *significamus* (15 : 1), *novimus* (28 : 2) are the most noticeable of these. They are the ones in which the intellectual element is most prominent, and their greater frequency is in harmony with the general indications of personality shown in S.

In making the divisions the occurrences in both indicative and subjunctive have been counted together, as the same element of personality is involved in both moods. Passages containing infinitives dependent on *possumus* and *debemus* have been classified according to the infinitives, as the entire expression is practically equivalent to a potential.

aa. In only a few passages in S. is the future used where reference is made to the intention of the writer in other parts of his work : 2, 506, speaking of the various theories about the death of Priam, he says: et hanc opinionem plene Vergilius sequitur, ut suo indicabimus loco, a reference to the comment ad v. 557. 5, 498 SUBSEdit . . . de quo verbo plenius dicturi sumus illo versu (XI 268) devicta Asia subseedit adulter. In two other passages—6, 127 suis locis hic esse comprobabimus; 6, 140 sic intellegentes removebimus quaestionem—the future refers to what immediately follows.

3. *Perfect Passive.*

Dictum est (2 : 102).—One of the most noticeable differences between the two commentaries is in the use of the perfect passive of *dico* by D. instead of the active form used by S. The favorite form of expression of each is avoided by the other. S. has ut supra dictum est 3, 163, where *diximus* is used in the preceding part of the comment, and B. 1, 2. But the difference in relative frequency is not the only one with reference to the use of the active and passive of *dico*. In S. the references are only to preceding parts of the commentary, showing that it was carefully

developed, each part of the comments dependent only on preceding parts. The references in D. are to both earlier and later portions of the work, as though the comments in D. were merely additions to a mass of comments already existing, and which was regarded by the writer as a work already completed, at least so far as the comments of S. were concerned. S., it is true, uses the future in a few passages, but this only indicates that coming portions of the work were not yet written. Moeller, *Quaestiones Servianae* (Kiliae, 1892), p. 33, refers to the passive forms used by S. as contradicting the statement made by Thilo, *Servius*, vol. I, p. xiv, with regard to the personal character of the *Servius*. Taking into account the limited number of occurrences of the personal expression in D. and of the impersonal in S., they can not be considered as forming a valid basis for an argument showing that the diction in the two commentaries is alike. It shows that each might, had he so willed, have used the form chosen by the other. It is the voluntary selection of different forms from among a number of forms accessible to each that clearly distinguishes the two works. A few quotations will show the freedom with which D. referred to more advanced parts of the commentary: 1, 305 *de quo loco suo in quarto libro dictum est*; 4, 462 *quod plenius in primo georgicorum dictum est*; 3, 420 *sane alia Scylla fuit, de qua in bucolicis (VI 74) plenius dictum est*; 8, 677 *de eo in tertio georgicorum in ipso loco plenius dictum est*. The difference between the two commentaries is shown in a few passages. Ad 5, 737 S. says: *latet enim, ut supra (I 277) diximus, verum nomen urbis*; D. adds: *et nomen quidem Romae a poeta dictum est; nam verum urbis nomen, ut dictum est, latet*. 9, 4 is somewhat similar, S. using *ut diximus*, while D. has *plenius illo dictum est*, but with reference to another word. Cf. B. 6, 61 *quod plenius in Aeneidos tertio libro (113) memoravimus, ubi etiam de ipsis malis fabula relata est. Ostensum est* occurs in S. 1, 19 (*om. KC'*), *monstratum est* 1, 1. Eleven other instances are in D., *relatum* occurring five times, and *narratum est* 4, 99; 5, 30 *sicut narratum est*. The plural, *dicta sunt*, is used in D. (11, 69), and *narrata sunt* 1, 744 and 6, 286, in both instances referring to succeeding comments, as is also the case in 2, 310; 2, 456; 3, 466, where other forms of *narrare* are used.

B. Reader.

1. *Second Person Singular, Present Indicative.*

The Servius has somewhat of a professorial tone in the frequent recurrence of the second person of the verb, the most frequently occurring of which is *subaudis* (75 : 3). This is also used in the imperative 1, 640; 4, 597; 6, 36; 1, 190, and B. 1, 53, though some MSS give the indicative in the first three passages. In D. *subaudis* is found 2, 79; 4, 293; 8, 35. The second person sing. is found in twenty-five other passages, seven of which are in D.: 1, 97; G. 1, 8 plenius habes; B. 6, 27 plene habes; G. 3, 174 dum quosdam domas; 4, 696; 5, 245. Both S. and D. have the sec. per. 10, 628 *agis* . . . loqueris. *Intellegis* occurs five times in S.: 1, 559; 1, 598; 3, 260; 6, 640; 6, 654. In about half of the remaining instances the indicative is used with *si* either with or without an accompanying subjunctive, e. g. 1, 743 *si fabulam respicis* . . . intellege; *si autem veritatem requiris, varia est opinio philosophorum*; B. 3, 16 *ut si dicas* . . . ponis, *si autem velis* . . . exprimes. 10, 62 *si* . . . vis referre, *sic dic*: . . . *si vero* . . . vis referre, *sic intellege*. The best illustration of the use in an independent statement is 1, 530 *aut enim Hesperiam solam dicis et significas Italiam, aut addis 'ultimam' et significas Hispaniam*. For an instance of the sec. per. explaining the words of Vergil, see 5, 711 *EST TIBI id est habes*.

2. *Future.*

Invenies is found seven times in D., five times (1, 651; 3, 211; 3, 274; 5, 105; 9, 213) with *plenius* where reference is made to a fuller discussion of the subject in other parts of the commentary. In 11, 243 *invenies* is used in the same way, while 3, 399 the reference is to a passage in Tacitus. *Referes* occurs 8, 88 *vel ad Tiberim, vel ad stagnum referes*. These passages have no parallels in S., where the future is used, as in B. 3, 16 (line 15 above), only in the conclusion of a conditional sentence, e. g. 8, 402 *si solvas, invenies*; 3, 671 *si detraxeris, invenies*. Cf. D. ad G. 4, 399 *inanes eos facies, si adhibueris vim*; 9, 51 *quidquid enim addideris sensus admittet*.

3. *Present Subjunctive.*

The second person of the present subjunctive is most commonly used in conditional or result clauses, though in D. there are a few

exceptions: 4, 696 nolo illum putes universa confundere; 9, 569 nescias de quo dixerit; 11, 258 ne putes forte factum; G. 2, 434 et transit iam ad illa, quae putes contemnenda. S. has per quod possis perire 7, 461, and nec mireris equas currere G. 1, 59.

One of the most common forms of statement in the subjunctive is the comparative conditional *ut si dicas*, which is found twenty-one times in S., and in D. 12, 162 ut si dicas 'tempora radiis cingitur.' In addition to *ut si dicas*, S. (6, 724) has ut si includas and ut si . . . polluas et eam statim auferas. There is no difference shown in the use of the present in conditional (42 : 15) and result clauses (17 : 4).

4. Imperfect.

Excepting 2, 393 mire 'adcommodat,' ut ignorares, quorum esset, the use of the imperfect is confined to S., which has *ut putares* eight times, e. g. 3, 665; 5, 1 sic altum, ut medium putares; 5, 110 sic pulchri, ut sacros p.; 5, 119 ita magna, ut urbem p.; 10, 569 SIC ut non unam manum p.; 11, 672 tanta celeritate . . . ut unum ictum p. 1, 518 bene addidit 'lecti' ne penitus omnes intellegeres. Cf. 3, 284 ne intellegeres . . . acciperes. 11, 56 both D. and S. have *optares* for *optabis* in Vergil.

5. Perfect (37 : 13).

Legeris and *dixeris* are the verbs most commonly used in the perfect subjunctive, and generally refer to textual readings or interpretations of the meaning. In D. are two perfects not referring to the text: B. 9, 8 cum ab una parte ad cacumen ascenderis, ab alia usque ad aquam descenderis; G. 1, 106 qua duxeris sequuntur.

6. Imperative.

In four passages an imperative of Vergil is explained by a present subjunctive: 6, 95 NE CEDE ne cedas; 7, 202 NE FUGITE ne fugiatis, ne ignoretis; 9, 113 NE TREPIDATE ne festinetis. Cf. 6, 544 NE SAEVI ne irascere: Et antique dictum est: nam nunc 'ne saevias' dicimus. The verbs most commonly used are *accipe* (12 : 3), *intellige* (11 : 3), *ut puta* (10 : 4), *distingue* (1 : 3), *subdistingue* (2 : 1), *iunge* (3 : 2) and *vide* (1 : 4). In addition to these there are half a dozen scattering examples in S. The number of occurrences is small, and only in the case of *vide* does there seem to be a preference shown by either commentary.

7. Questions.

Questions direct as well as indirect are common in both commentaries, though in some respects they differ widely, D. much the more frequently resorting to a question instead of making a direct statement.

1. *Num* (22).—Questions introduced by *num* are confined to D., which has twenty-two examples, e. g. 10, 458 AVSVM num pro 'audentem'? 10, 67 FATIS AUCTORIBUS num hic 'responsis'?

2. *An*.—The use of *an* in direct questions is also very noticeable. It is found in 100 passages in D. (127 times), it being frequently repeated, and 3, 278 occurring four times in succession: INSUPERATA TELLVRE an quia saxosa loca; an quia per medios hostes navigaverant; an quia tempestate; an quia (cum) Graeca? However, the word is generally found in short questions, e. g. 11, 568 an ob feritatem? 12, 520 ipse pater, an pater eius? 12, 725 an inquiri, utrum tempus sit?

In D. there are fourteen passages in which *an* is used in an indirect question, e. g. 3, 80 consultum venerat, an Salaminam peteret comes Priamo. Only two such questions were noticed in S., 4, 56 explorant an dii vellent; 6, 404 quaeratur an animae de Elysio in corpora possint redire?

3. *Utrum . . . an* (27 : 80).—Though *utrum . . . an* is used in both commentaries, in S. the questions are indirect; in D. direct in all but nine passages. In S. the interrogative is in a few instances omitted, the comment merely continuing and being dependent on the statement of Vergil: 1, 517 QVAE FORTVNA utrum prospera, an adversa? 10, 890 MVLTA MOVENS utrum in ipsum, an in equum tela torqueret? G. 1, 25 INCERTVM EST, VRBESNE CAESAR utrum velis terrarum, an maris, an caeli imperium possidere? In D. nearly all are double direct questions, e. g. 3, 236 AC IVSSI hic 'iussi' utrum verbum an participium sit, id est utrum illi iussi sint, an ego iussi? 4, 143 ergo 'hibernam' utrum quod ibi hiemare soleat; an frigidam; an hieme temperatam; an quam hiberno tempore deserere soleat? 5, 426 utrum in pedum, an in manuum digitos? 8, 6 utrum ordine, an dignitate? 8, 675 utrum clipeo, an mari?

4. *Utrum* (6 : 2) is used alone a few times in both commentaries, and in D. twice in a direct question: 1, 239 utrum fatis bonis in praesentibus? 4, 449 et utrum 'inanes' quae Didoni nihil prosint?

5. *Num* . . . *an* is found in D. 10, 131 *quid est moliri?* *num* *inicere*, *an* *temptare?* and 10, 161 *et 'quaerit sidera'* *num* *de sideribus quaerit*, *an ipsa sidera*, *id est percenset.* *aut num causa quaerendi quod cupiat lucem?*

6. *Utrumne*.—Ad 1, 218 D. says '*seu pro utrumne*', and G. 1, 26 has *utrumne . . . velis* in a comment on a passage of Vergil containing *-ne . . . an*.

7. *Anne* was noticed in D. 8, 345 *interrogavit, anne hic, suum locum ostendens, invenissent.* In S. 1, 752 for *quales* in Vergil.

8. *Quis*.—Questions introduced by *quis* are not uncommon in D., but are avoided by S. They sound like school-room questions and in some cases are as much for the benefit of the questioner as of the hearer. These questions may be divided for convenience into several classes: Purely inquisitive (D. 10), *Quis ante hunc?*, without any indication whatever as to the answer, e. g. 12, 7 *sane 'latronem' venatorem quis ante hunc?* To the reader they indicate nothing more than 'Look it up,' and seem very much like marginal notes, as though some teacher or reader of Vergil had jotted them down as topics for future investigation. Repeated questions coming from pupils or other commentators, differing from the last only in this, that they depend on *quaeritur*: 4, 120; 8, 195; 12, 351; 12, 517; 12, 619 *quaeritur quis 'inlaetabile' dixerit?* In the other cases some word indicating time is used, as in 12, 351 *q. quis prius nigrantem dixerit?* Presumptive (2 : 8), in which *quis ignorat, nescit* or some similar term is used, as though the statement made was familiar to all. Of these S. has but three: 9, 134 *quis potest scire*; B. 8, 47 *quis enim ignorat Medeam . . . interemisse?* G. 4, 66. There are also a few general questions such as *quis indignetur* 10, 468; *quis ferret* 11, 417; *quis . . . deponat* 2, 668. Cf. 1, 8; 1, 78; 1, 92; 4, 176; 12, 761.

8. *Periphrastic Statements.*

The passive periphrastic form of the verb may be taken as the equivalent of an imperative. It is frequently used to indicate some necessary step in the interpretation of Vergil. In the use of some verbs the difference between S. and D. is clearly marked. *Sciendum* (194 : 13) is the form most commonly occurring. It is frequently preceded by *sane*, and in many instances is followed by *quia* or *quod* as is *notandum* (72 : 15). In this number is included 11, 879 *†potanda elocutio, quia consequatur 'hos,' sed intellegendum 'eos qui.'* (Potanda *F*, portanda *Daniel*, quod *quid*

sibi velit non intelligo. fortasse rotunda.) The frequent use of *notandum* in similar statements indicates that it should be the reading here. The most noticeable difference is in the use of *subaudiendum* (1 : 27). In addition to this, *audiendum* is used by D. 8, 397, and 9, 613 *bis audiendum*. *Pronuntiandum* is used (4 : 14), though with the latter might be placed *enuntiandum* 1, 507; and *adiuvandum pronuntiatione* 11, 258; 11, 303; G. 1, 146. A few others indicate a preference on the part of D.: *accipiendum* (12 : 22), *intellegendum* (17 : 22), *fero* and comps. (5 : 9), *iungendum* (5 : 7), and *suspendendum* (3 : 4). *Distinguendum* (34 : 8, including *subdistinguendum* 4, 323), *legendum* (16 : 8), and scattering examples (27 : 13) vary somewhat from the general average ratio.

C. Vergil.

The quotations from Vergil occur frequently in both commentaries, and there seems to be no difference so far as the use of the word *Vergilius* is concerned (266 : 85). There is a decided difference in the use of *poeta* instead of *Vergilius*, of *ac si diceret* referring to the words of Vergil, and of *per transitum* in calling attention to the transitions made by the poet.

1. *Poeta* (66 : 97).—The word *poeta* referring to Vergil is used relatively much more frequently in D. than in S. In both are found a few occurrences of *poeta* where it is used generically, and such instances are not counted. But aside from the difference in the relative frequency there are other indications of a difference between the two commentaries. S. does not attempt to characterize the poet, while D. is comparatively free in its laudations: 3, 349; 3, 463 occurs *divinus poeta*; 4, 262 *peritus poeta*; 1, 632 *poeta, amator antiquitatis*; 11, 532 *peritissimus antiquitatis poeta*; B. 8, 68 *Vergilius peritus antiquitatis*. Cf. 1, 305; 10, 419; G. 1, 269.

2. *Ac si diceret* (120 : 5).—In S., passages are fairly common in which an explanation of the words of Vergil is introduced by the words *ac si diceret*, e. g. G. 4, 229 *THESAVRIS repositionibus, ac si diceret, 'apothecis'*; 7, 204 *VETERIS antiqui, ac si diceret, aurei saeculi imagine vivimus*. 3, 156 *TVAQVE ARMAQVE SECVTI ac si diceret, 'tuas partes.'* D. has *proinde ac si diceret*, G. 3, 56, in a comment introduced by *et aliter*, as is also G. 2, 350; G. 1, 29 *ac si graece diceret*. In the comments on the Aeneid it is found 4, 218 (*edidit Stephanus*) and 4, 207 (*om. Daniel.*). Somewhat similar expressions are found in S. 3, 104 *ac si dici possit*, and B. 1, 32 *ut . . . dixerit peculium, ac si servus esset*.

The typical form of expression in D. is shown by B. 7, 64 *perinde enim est, ac si dixisset*, the pluperfect *dixisset* with *quam si*, following a comparative, occurring eighteen times, e. g. 10, 370 *melius 'ducis' quam si dixisset 'regis.'* The imperfect *diceret* is used five times, e. g. 2, 161 *magnificentius, quam si diceret 'Troiani.'* S. has the imperfect eighteen times, e. g. B. 2, 70 *SEMIPVTATA . . . plus est quam si inputata diceret.* S. ad 5, 376 has *OSTENDIT melius dixisset 'ostentat,'* and D. 12, 906 *ut si dixisset.* Both have *ut si diceret* 3, 36; [2, 403], and *ut si dicatur* is found 9, 138. In conditional sentences D. has *dixisset* four times, and *diceret* once, while S. has the latter twenty times. As will be seen, the form in S. is the imperfect subjunctive (160), while in D. there is a preference for the pluperfect (23 : 13). This indicates that the work of Vergil is viewed by S. as if it were a present work, while in D. it is considered as distinctly of the past.

3. *Per transitum* (48 : 2).—*Transitum* occurs most commonly in connection with *per*, though in four passages (1, 226; 2, 65; 10, 672; B. 6, 41) it is used with *facere*, and 9, 1 with *culpae*. The passages in D. containing *per transitum* (3, 287 *poeta p. t. tetigit*; B. 6, 43 *p. t. tetigit*) are similar to the ones in S., which uses the phrase most frequently with *tangere* and *ostendere*.

D. Sources.

1. *Definite*.—a. *Verbs of Saying, etc.; Active.*

Of the verbs used in the third singular present giving the words or opinions of Vergil, of other authors, or of characters in the Aeneid, *ait* and *dicit* are by far the most common. It is impossible to draw any exact line of demarcation between the two on the basis of the character of the statement dependent on them. *Dicit* is sometimes followed by statements of Vergil, as 6, 687 *dicit 'sic equidem ducebam animo'*; and *ait* is sometimes used where only an indefinite statement is made, as 1, 30 *in quinto ait Neptuni beneficio liberatus*. However, the distinction holds in a general way that *ait* is used with exact quotations, and *dicit* with general statements which may also include the exact words of authors. It is impossible to compare the words with reference to the use of the word *Vergilius* as subject, since the characters in the poems are represented as quoting the words assigned to them by Vergil. No effort has been made to verify the completeness of the results of a single examination of the occurrences of these

words, but from the number of instances collected (*ait* 576 : 333 ; *dicit* 905 : 254), it seems that S. uses *dicit* more freely than *ait*, and D. *ait* relatively more frequently than *dicit*.

When *ut* is used with *dicit* the subject is generally placed second, as 1, 52 *ut* Varro *dicit*, and the number is much greater in S. than in D. (58 : 3). *Ait* with *ut* or *sicut* is used about the same number of times in the two commentaries (25 : 23), but the subject is more frequently second in D. than in S. (5 : 12). *Docet* is used about the same by both (36 : 14), *refert* is found in twenty-four passages in D.; *tradit poeta* is used by S. 1, 387, but the verb occurs in fourteen passages in D. Other verbs have not been carefully noticed, though there seems to be a preference shown by D. for *appellare* of the verbs used in naming.

aa. Passive Forms.

A large number of verbs is used in the present passive in some of which the preference of the writer is clearly seen: *Traditur*, like the active forms, is characteristic of D. (17), as is *videtur* with *aliis*, *quibusdam*, etc. (D. 19), S. having *placet* 9, 703; 11, 93; G. 2, 389. *Accipitur* (1 : 7), *intellegitur* (18 : 16) are relatively most frequent in D., as are a few infinitives with *posse*, *debet*, or *oportet*: *accipi* (9 : 37), *subaudiri* (7 : 10), *referri* (22 : 12). A few others are preferred by S., *invenitur* (48 : 10). *Legitur* (54 : 22), frequently with *et* in the discussion of textual readings, is used by both in giving quotations from Vergil as well as from other authors.

b. Prepositions 'according to.'

1. *Secundum* (421 : 65).—Both this preposition and *iuxta* are used with the names of authors as well as with a considerable number of other words indicating the source or the ground for an assertion made by the commentator. For convenience the instances will be divided into several classes.

a. Author named (153 : 12).—*Secundum* in S. is used with the names of quite a large number of authors, Greek and Latin, early and late. In D. four Romans are mentioned by name: Sallust 8, 479; Trebatius 11, 316; Varro and Cassius 12, 603. Two Greeks are mentioned 3, 212, *furiarum mater secundum Hesiodum Terra, secundum Aeschylum Nox est*.

β. References to persons not named (106 : 19).—In this division there is no apparent difference between the two commen-

taries, at least so far as the words dependent on *secundum* are concerned, it being used with the names of sects—*sectas*, *Epicurios*, *Stoicos*—with general titles—*mathematicos*, *physicos*, *philosophos*, *theologos*—with pronouns—*alios*, *aliquos*, *quosdam*, *eos* limited by *qui dicunt*—names of nations—*Aegyptios*, *Etruscos*, *Graecos*, *Persas*, *Romanos*—with terms designating the ancients—*antiquos*, *veteres*—and a few other words of similar import.

γ. Abstract nouns (137 : 29).—Here the usage is about the same as in the last division, the preposition being used with such nouns as *morem*, *ritum*, *ius*, *naturam*, *opinionem*, *rationem*, *etymologiam*, *euphoniā*, *usum*, *sensum*, etc. The words of S. are repeated by D. in two passages, 1, 8 ; 4, 469. Ad 6, 34 the Greek given by S. is translated by D. : κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον intellegimus *id est secundum taciturnitatem* (om. G.), though the Greek occurs elsewhere without notice in both commentaries. Cf. 4, 227 ; 7, 195 ; 9, 83 ; 11, 152.

δ. Statement of an Author (16 : 4).—*Secundum quod* is found in S. fourteen times, e. g. 11, 262 *secundum quod*, ut supra diximus, Menelaus ad Aegyptum Iovis voluntate pervenit. *Sec. illud* occurs 7, 7 ; B. 7, 23 SI NON POSSVMVS OMNES *secundum illud* dixit (VIII 63) non omnia possumus omnes. D. has *sec. illud* 9, 266 ; 11, 224 ; *sec. ea* G. 1, 263 ; and *sec. haec* G. 4, 399.

ε. Work of an Author (9 : 1).—Three passages in S. (1, 287 ; G. 3, 25 ; 2, 533) have *sec. historiam*. In five places the name of a work is given with *sec.*: B. 5, 66 Porphyrii librum, quem solem appellavit ; 3, 571 Aetnam Vergilii ; 5, 370 Troica Neronis ; 3, 284 Cic. Hortensium ; 8, 314 Hesiodi Theogoniam. Ad 4, 469 both S. and D. have *sec. tragoediam Pacuvii*.

2. *Iuxta* (5 : 51).—For convenience of comparison the divisions here will correspond to those made in the case of *secundum*.

a. With the names of authors *iuxta* occurs in the Scholia four times, and twice in S.: 1, 96 i. Homerum ; G. 2, 159 i. Catonem.

β. (D. 14.)—In this division *iuxta* is found with *antiquos* or *veteres* in all but two places : 8, 364 i. sectam Cynicam ; B. 8, 75 i. Pythagoreos.

γ. (3 : 30.)—*Iuxta* and *secundum* are used in the same comment in D.: 2, 426 'Iustum' *sec. leges* . . . 'aequum' *iuxta naturam* accipiunt ; and in 3, 18 hic *sec. accusativum* . . . aliter *iuxta nominativum*. In S. the two words are used together : 10, 230 hoc loco *sec. quartam declinationem*, in bucolicis (VIII 22) *iuxta secundam*. Here the use of *iuxta* was due to *secundam*,

as also with *secundam formam* B. 2, 54. S. also has *iuxta* with *regulam* 7, 683. In D. it is used most frequently with *morem* and *usum*.

8.—*Iuxta illud* is found twice in D., 4, 62; 6, 278. *Iuxta illud dictum*, followed by a quotation, occurs 4, 56.

bb. Prepositions 'in.'

The encroachment in late Latin of *in* on *apud* with the names of authors is well known. The extension of the use of *in* was probably due to the use of that preposition in references to the works bearing the names of persons. Familiarity with passages such as *Cicero in maiore Catone* (G. 3, 96) and *Cicero in Hortensio* (8, 479; 485), and especially those in which the name of the author was omitted, such as *in heauton timorumenon* (1, 548), must have gradually accustomed the Romans to the use of *in* for *apud*.

1. *In* (92 : 3).—*In* with the names of authors is practically confined to S., it being found in D., 4, 698 in Catone (in *T* a marginal reading); 7, 464 in toto Vergilio ("*e Turonensi Daniel edidit*") (cf. 1, 576 in omni Vergilio); 10, 164 in idoneis auctoribus ("*ex uno Turonensi Daniel edidit*"). S. uses *in* with the names of authors the same as with the names of works: 1, 4 constat multa in auctoribus inveniri . . . invenitur etiam in aliis partibus orationis; 10, 105 et in Sallustio et in Philippicis; 12, 359 in historiis legimus, item in Lucano; B. prooem., p. 2, 2 in poeta . . . in Aeneide. It is also used with *apud* for the sake of variety: 6, 154 DEMVM et haec particula tam apud Vergilium, quam apud omnes idoneos auctores hoc significat, licet in aliis diversa significat.

2. *Apud* (32 : 28).—The relative number of occurrences of *apud* is greater in D. than in S., but about the same for both *in* and *apud* if the two words be considered together. This is also true for *secundum* and *iuxta*. With the latter, D. uses both; S. practically only one, *secundum*. With *in* and *apud* this is reversed, S. using both, while D. prefers *apud*. The difference in the use of *in* and *apud* may be taken as an indication that the scholiast followed rules of composition based on classic models, while S., with more independence, used the freer form of expression of his own times. The examples of the use of *apud* are alike in both commentaries, and of themselves indicate nothing in regard to authorship. But taken in connection with those containing *in*,

there is seen to be a clear indication of voluntary selection in the case of the two words.

Besides the instances where *apud* occurs with the names of authors, or with pronouns referring to authors, there are a number of instances in which it is used with *Graecos* or with *Latinos*, or with both, as 1, 257 omnia quae apud Graecos et diphthongon habent apud Latinos in e productum convertuntur. Most of these are general references to the Greeks and Latins, but in some instances, as 1, 394 *apud Graecos legitur, auctores* is to be supplied.

2. Indefinite References.

References and quotations assigned to no particular author are very common in both commentaries. A very convenient way of giving the general conclusions of others without giving their exact words, their greater frequency in D. is a very fair indication of its greater indefiniteness as compared with S. We have noticed 1484 passages in which *alii*, *quidam*, or some other indefinite subject is used to set forth the opinions of others. In over two hundred of these passages the subject is repeated one or more times, though but one verb is used, e. g. 1, 533 *alii . . . alii . . . alii . . . alii . . . alii . . . alii . . . alii*. In a much less number two verbs are used with the same subject, e. g. 2, 394 *multi hic distinguunt et ad Aeneam referunt*. Such passages have been classed with the first verb used, as the number is not large enough to materially affect the general proportion of the different words used. As there are some preferences shown both in the case of subject and of verb, these will be considered separately.

a. *Subject* (468 : 1016).

1. *Alii* (257 : 404).—*Alii* is found more frequently than any other indefinite subject, and is more freely used in D. than in S. This is due to the fact that the statements in D. are supplementary to those of S. or make statements at variance with those contained in it.

2. *Quidam* (75 : 460).—Statements containing *quidam* are about the same as those containing *alii*, though in a few instances D. seems to bring under it a statement which has already been made by S. Cf. I, 317; 2, 7.

3. *Nonnulli* (16 : 81).—With *nonnulli* the differences are less marked, though D. uses the term much the more freely. Among

the examples in S. has been counted 10, 832 *statuae nonnullae antiquorum* docent.

4. *Multi* (103 : 55), 5. *Plerique* (15 : 4).—With these words is given a general summary of views, and the relative number is about the same in S. and D., though it might be expected that they would occur more frequently in D.

6. *Aliqui, aliquot, aliquanti* (1 : 8).—S. 2, 195 has *aliqui male dicant*, while D. has *aliqui accipiunt* 1, 109; 1, 519; G. 1, 55; 240; *aliquanti* 3, 628; 11, 633; G. 1, 29; *aliquot* 1, 121.

7. With *sunt qui* only a few instances are found, most of them being in D. 2, 121; 3, 332; 8, 343; B. 6, 41; in S. 11, 262.

One feature worthy of note is the use of *male, stulte* or some such word giving a little hint of the attitude of the commentator to his brethren of the same craft. This is especially characteristic of S., which has *male* twenty-nine times with *quidam*, e. g. G. 3, 46 *nam male quidam 'ardentis Caesaris' accipiunt*. A little variety is sometimes given by the use of *stulte*, e. g. 4, 1 *licet stulte quidam dicant*. *Vile* is used 8, 439; *pessime* 12, 715.

aa. Verbs (468 : 1016).

While the differences between the commentaries are noticeable in the case of the subjects, it is still more so when the verbs only are considered. As the ratio of the occurrences in the mass is about 1 : 2, we should expect about the same ratio in the case of the individual verbs. Some of them do not differ very materially from this. (1) *Dicunt* (124 : 198) and (2) *volunt* (129 : 213) are of the most frequent occurrence, and go far toward establishing the ratio for the entire mass. (3) *Intelligunt* (7 : 32), in S. only with *alii*, (4) *putant* (8 : 58) and (5) *accipiunt* (25 : 211) differ widely from the general ratio, the latter verb especially seeming to be a favorite with D., though the favoritism is much more clearly shown in the case of (6) *tradunt* (1 : 157), S. using it 3, 63 *quidam manes deos infernos tradunt*, followed in D. by *quidam* ... *dicunt*: plurimi ... *tradiderunt*; alii ... (7) *Legunt* (80 : 33) reverses the ratio for the mass and shows the closer attention paid by S. to questions of textual reading. (8) The miscellaneous verbs occurring but a small number of times each are about equally divided (94 : 114). In the case of a few, however, individual preferences are shown: *exponunt* (1 : 10), *reprehendunt* (1 : 9) and *quaerunt* (10 : 3) being the most noticeable.

In a comparatively few instances in both commentaries *dicunt* and *vocant* are used without specified subject, e. g. (in S.) 1, 649 quod vulgo herbacanthum dicunt; B. 5, 17 herbae genus, quam Orcitunicam vulgo vocant; (in D.) G. 2, 478 quod vulgo dicunt 'laborat luna'; B. 8, 55 quas vulgo ulucos vocant. *Atunt*, *ferunt* and *perhibent* (a Vergilian reminiscence) occur a few times in D., though in most of these the subject may refer to a preceding noun or pronoun at some distance from the verb.

b. Substituted Expressions.

1. *Alii sic*.—One feature in D. worthy of notice is the use of *sic* with *alii* or *quidam* without any verb expressed. Both *ita* and *sic* are freely used with verbs, e. g. 1, 12 *veteres colonias ita definiunt*; 9, 230 *alii sic intelligunt*; but the omission of the verb is peculiar to D. and is found but rarely outside of the comments on G., where it is used seven times. *Alii ita* is used in one doubtful passage, 2, 159, and *alii* twice, 11, 56, where *T* reads *quidam sic . . . alii ita*, the latter occurring again 8, 216. *Alii sic accipiunt* is followed by *alii sic*, 11, 443. *Quidam sic* occurs G. 4, 483, preceded by *et aliter*, which also precedes *alii sic* G. 3, 5; 3, 35; 4, 39; and follows 4, 386.

2. *Et aliter* (D. 224).—At no point do the Scholia differ more from S. than in the use of *et aliter* in the comments on G. It is used to introduce a divergent or an additive statement without any reference to the source from which it came, e. g. G. 2, 271 AXI septentrioni; nam ἄμαξα dicitur. *et aliter: id est septentrionali*. Though generally equivalent to *alii dicunt*, to the scholiast it seems to have been merely a formula, for G. 2, 70 we find *et aliter: alii legunt*, one of which is superfluous. The use of *et aliter* in this portion of the Scholia shows that it must have been written by some one not the author of any other part, for it is altogether improbable that a writer using the term so freely could have written other parts where there was abundant opportunity for its use without introducing it into the comments. It is an indication of personal preference so marked that by itself it is sufficiently strong to establish the fact that the writer of these parts was not the author of any other parts of the commentary.

3. *Aliter* (47 : 29).—*Aliter* is used by D. the same as *et aliter* is used in the comments on G., and is equivalent to *alii* with a verb or *alibi aliter dicitur*, e. g. 3, 73 item aliter; 8, 189 aliter in

quarto. In S. the word is regularly used with a verb—most generally *procedit*—showing the necessity for a preceding statement, e. g. 1, 250 sic loquitur quasi una sit de Troianis; nam aliter sensus non procedit; 6, 517 euantis Phrygias: aliter non stat versus. (*Aliter* . . . *aliter* occurs a comparatively few number of times—4 : 10—in contrasted statements.)

c. *Fabula*.

Fabula talis est (15 including *haec* 3, 104; 6, 659: 28 including *ista* 3, 489; *sic* G. 3, 391). With verbs S. has *ut fabula fert* 5, 801; D. *loqui* 1, 618; 619; 744; B. 10, 18. *Narratur* is used 2, 44; 3, 466 *narratur et alia fabula*. In S. the prevailing form of statement is with *habet*; as, *ut habet fabula* 3, 14, but more generally with *hoc* as object (7), e. g. 8, 568 *fabula quidem hoc habet*. This use of *hoc* is not confined to *fabula*, for we have noticed a score of passages in S. where it is used with other words; as, *historia*, *veritas*, *opinio* and *ratio*. Similar examples are of rare occurrence in D.: 1, 619 *ut veritas habet*; 2, 250 *sphaerae ratio habet*; G. 1, 100 *expositio hoc habet*.

d. *Archaisms*.

An outline of the use of *antiqui*, *maiores*, *veteres* in D. and S. has been given in a previous article (A. J. P. XV 166 seqq.), so far as they are used with verbs of speaking. The following presentation will consider all the occurrences of the words, not only as nouns but also as adjectives.

1. *Archaismos*.—There are no special features in the use of this word, the MSS of both the commentaries having a tendency to confuse it with the word *sarcasmos*.

2. *Vetus* (17 : 194).—When *veteres* is used as subject (11 : 97), *dicebant* is the verb of most frequent occurrence in D., though found but four times in S. The genitive plural *veterum* occurs seven times in D.; *a veteribus tractum* 10, 270; *veteribus mos fuit* G. 3, 305. As an adjective, *vetus* is used thirty times in D., but in S. only 8, 361 *curiis veteribus*. *Apud veteres* (5 : 27) is more evenly divided between S. and D. than either *secundum veteres* (D. 8) or *iuxta veteres* (D. 8). *Vetusta voce* occurs 2, 77; *vetustissimorum sacrorum* 10, 419; *vetustas* 5, 448, and *vetuste* eleven times.

3. *Antiquus* (144 : 71).—In the use of the different forms of *antiquus* the two commentaries approach more nearly the general

average ratio for the two works, though there are a few special features in the usage of each. As subject, *antiqui* occurs about the same number of times in each (27 : 24). As an adjective (100 : 38) the number in D. is considerably smaller, a few examples in each being comparatives or superlatives. In the plural, the genitive (3 : 3) is not common. S. has the accusative three times with *apud*, while D. has eleven instances with *apud*, *iuxta* or *secundum*. *Antiquitas* (6 : 2) is occasionally met with, and *antiquatum* occurs 4, 431. *Antique* is much more freely used by D. than by S. (7 : 16). The number of occurrences is, however, less noticeable than the fact that the word in D. is used independently of any other word, while in S. it occurs only in connection with some other word indicating time, as in 4, 403 POPVLANT antique dixit: nam hoc verbum apud veteres activum fuit, nunc tantum deponens est.

4. *Maiores* (93 : 5).—The use of *maiores* is characteristic of S., but is avoided by D. As subject it occurs twenty-eight times in S., twice in D.: 6, 1 calas enim dicebant maiores nostri fustes (see crit. app. ad loc.), and 3, 148 eaque nostros publice curasse maiores, in a quotation from Varro. *Apud maiores* is found (58 : 2—6, 1; 1, 632), and other cases (7 : 1), the latter being due to *veterum* preceding: 8, 105 et libri veterum tradunt a maioribus sacrificando parsimoniam observatam esse. S. has *nostri* 1, 179; 1, 737; 7, 176; 7, 787; 6, 660; B. 5, 73. In addition to the two instances given above, D. has *maiores nostri* 1, 632, *apud maiores nostros* mos fuit, and adds it to the statement of S. 3, 257 *maiores enim nostri* has *mensas* habebant (*nostri et mensas hab. C*), and 8, 269.

Both *maiores* and *veteres* are used 8, 423 *plerumque m. ponere consuetos v. dicere solebant*. 7, 601 *antiquos* in contrast to *vicinos* is used to modify *maiores*: *volens ostendere antiquos eius consulares fuisse, vicinos vero ignavissimos*. (*Nostri 'hostes' pro hospitibus dixerunt* occurs 4, 424, in a comment contrasting Roman and Grecian derivation of the word for enemy.)